

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated October 17, 2003. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 33, 35, and 37-39 have been amended. Claims 1-39 are presently pending. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Office Action had a number of objections to the claims to provide antecedent basis for terms within the claims. Although the Applicants disagree that at least some of these objections are proper, the Applicants have amended the claims to provide the requested antecedent basis.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a system for color display” instead of “a color display system”.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite “a projector” instead of “a color electronic display projector”.

Claim 33 has been amended to recite “a method for color display” instead of “a color display method”.

Claims 1, 3-4, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 26 have been amended to recite “the pixellated electronic display panel”.

Claim 33 has been amended to remove “the display element”.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these objections.

§ 102 and §103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 11-15, 19-20, 29-30, 3-35, and 36-39 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,280,037 to Smith (hereinafter “Smith”). Claims 3-7, 16-17, and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,828 to Steiner et al. (hereinafter “Steiner”). Claims 18 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,654 to Shirochi (hereinafter “Shirochi”). The Applicants traverse these rejections.

Independent claims 1, 19, and 39 have been amended to clarify the Applicant’s invention. These claims recite a system/projector that includes a dynamic displacement element that



repeatedly displaces alignment of color-component sub-pixels generated by an electronic display panel(s) through a sequence of positions. Independent claim 33 has been similarly amended to recite a step of dynamically and repeatedly aligning the color-component sub-pixels through a sequence of positions to form a color display. In each case, the sub-pixels are repeatedly aligned through a sequence of positions. In other words, the alignment of the sub-pixels is cycled repeatedly through a sequence of positions. This can be used to improve image resolution.

In contrast, Smith discloses a device and method for aligning images from green, red, and blue beams. This alignment is made until the three images are correctly superimposed. Once a proper alignment has been achieved in the Smith device/method, there is no further need to alter alignment unless the images become misaligned again. This is not, however, a dynamic alignment of sub-pixels repeatedly through a sequence of positions as claimed and described by the Applicants. There is no repeated cycling through a sequence of positions in Smith. Such a cycling would not likely address the problem that Smith is attempting to solve: the misalignment of light beams.

None of the other references cited in the Office Action address these deficiencies of Smith. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 19, 33, and 39, as well as claims 2-18, 20-32, and 33-38 which depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references for at least these reasons. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested. Allowance of claims 1-39, as amended, at an early date is solicited.

RECEIVED

Respectfully submitted,

FEB 24 2004

By:


Bruce E. Black, Reg. No.: 41,622
Telephone No.: (651) 736-3366

Feb. 11, 2004
Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833